DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 357 SP 038 940

AUTHOR Gettys, Cynthia M.; Ray, Barbara M.; Rutledge, Valerie C.; Puckett, Kathleen S.; Stepanske, Jeanette B.

TITLE The Professional Development School Experience Evaluation.
PUB DATE 1999-11-17
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Point Clear, AL, November 17-19, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *College School Cooperation; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Program Evaluation; Student Role; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS University of Tennessee Chattanooga

ABSTRACT

This study addressed the use of Professional Development Schools (PDSs) as a component of the teacher preparation program at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga. The study measured differences in perceptions of all groups involved in the PDS process. The five groups under study were PDS students, university faculty, and PDS onsite coordinators, classroom teachers, and administrators. Participants completed a survey instrument that asked them to rank curriculum and planning for teaching, roles, university-PDS relationships, and perceptions. They also answered four open-ended questions about how they perceived the PDS experience. Data analysis indicated that the PDS experience was successful because of the relationship between the university and the local school system established by the onsite coordinators. The PDSs were also successful because of the license given to university faculty members to make changes within the program from semester to semester. Another factor key to the PDS program's success was the enthusiasm of university faculty involved in each PDS site. Finally, the program's success was influenced by the selection of sites that had a philosophy and faculty that supported the PDS concept. (Contains 19 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 357

The Professional Development School Experience Evaluation

by

Cynthia M. Gettys

Barbara M. Ray

Valerie C. Rutledge

Kathleen S. Puckett

Jeanette B. Stepanske

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Presented at the

Mid-South Education Research Association

Point Clear, Alabama

November 17, 1999

SP038940

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. M. Gettys

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

Teacher preparation programs have typically been confined to college classrooms involving little interaction with students and teachers in school settings until student teaching during the final semester of the senior year. During the 1990's, teacher education institutions have begun developing programs that combine theory and practice in more real-life experiences for prospective teachers. In response to this need, one avenue that is receiving a great deal of attention is the collaborative creation of Professional Development Schools (PDS) (Berg & Murphy, 1993). Such schools, analogous to teaching hospitals in the medical profession, involve practicing teachers in the preparation and training of future teachers. Since both public school systems and colleges of education have significant interest in preparing effective new teachers, PDS's serve as centers for preparation and research.

According to Lee Teitel (1999), PDS's are having important and measurable impacts on schools and teacher education institutions and are showing positive effects on student learning, teacher preparation, and continued learning of experienced educators. At the same time there are challenges in institutionalizing PDS's: sorting out reciprocity and the levels of commitment, especially from the university, and balancing individual effort and institutional engagement.

Purpose of the Study

As a teacher training institution, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga's mission is to prepare teachers who excel in the teaching profession and are prepared for the challenges of the 21st century classroom. The current study addresses the use of the PDS as a component of the teacher preparation program and measures the differences in perceptions of all groups involved in the Professional Development School process. The UTC PDS experience takes place when the students are enrolled as second semester sophomores or first semester juniors. Specifically, this study reports the perceptions of PDS students, University faculty, and the PDS

on-site coordinators, classroom teachers and administrators regarding the initial impact of the PDS experience.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the PDS sites that have been developed by a metropolitan university located in the southeast and generalizations cannot be made to any other PDS programs at other universities. This study investigated the perceptions of the university students, university faculty, the PDS on-site coordinators, classroom teachers and the local school administrators. The number of students n=191 was much greater than the number of university faculty n=8, on-site coordinators n=6, administrators n=4 and classroom teachers n=47. These differences in size made statistical comparison questionable. Since perceptions were measured rather than actual behavior differences, the biases of the respondents could have impacted the findings of the study.

Significance of the Study

The differences in the perceptions of the five groups involved (university students and faculty, on-site coordinators, classroom teachers and the local school administrators) enabled university faculty to reevaluate the need for continued restructuring efforts that impact teacher education programs. This study also provided insight for other universities and public schools considering linking theory and practice through collaboration and on-site preparation. The idea of creating Professional Development Schools gives schools of education and school districts an opportunity to play a collaborative role in teacher preparation. Finally, the actual collection of the data afforded all five groups of participants the opportunity to reflect upon and assess the initial PDS experience.

Overview

The Professional Development School is a new paradigm that incorporates the most positive and realistic aspects of teacher preparation into a semester-long early field placement

experience. Students enroll as a cohort and become an extension of the faculty at the school to which they have been assigned. Rather than spending hours in a college classroom discussing the theoretical ideas of education, these students learn methods and strategies for teaching along with specific ideas for classroom management and then immediately move into a classroom of real students where they can put these concepts into practice. Conversely, when students experience problems in K-12 classrooms, they can within days discuss those concerns and search for solutions with university, school system and peer support. This program offers the opportunity to coordinate university training with firsthand experience in a real, working classroom setting.

This new approach to teacher preparation is in response to the challenge to develop educators who are better prepared, who have a clearer understanding of the difficulties and realities of the classroom, and who will become reflective practitioners who will reflect upon their own teaching performance and identify areas of needed change and improvement. Arthur Wise (1996) notes that this continuum of teacher preparation and development represents a new collaboration on the education scene" (p. 192.) If we hope to develop a well-qualified group of educators for the next century, we must recognize that our programs and our experiences must meet the needs of our students and those they will teach.

As our Professional Development School has evolved, it has been expanded from serving multidisciplinary (elementary) majors, to include PK-4 (prekindergarten through grade 4) majors, secondary majors, and special education majors. This mixture of students has enabled the faculty of the university to adapt their courses and present them to their students in an integrated format which more closely resembles the educational setting in which they will be employed after graduation. In addition to enabling the college students to gain a broader perspective of the education profession, they also learn about the interdisciplinary nature of their field and the need to understand how it relates to a wide range of subjects. A side benefit of this

program is early identification of the appropriateness of their age/grade level choice for certification.

Arbitrary divisions traditionally made among early childhood, middle school, secondary, and special education, as well as those between and among the various content areas/disciplines, have been reduced. The goal was to provide a broad-spectrum examination of the education process during this early field placement. The net result is an increased awareness of student diversity as well as what takes place before and after a particular age-group level, content, or competency. In addition, this larger picture allows for a clearer understanding of and increased relevancy regarding the focus of any given lesson.

The Professional Development School semester also provides other intangible benefits to its participants. Graduates who have had this experience have developed a network of contacts with those teachers and administrators in whose schools they have worked. They have been a part of the everyday activities of the school and have seen for themselves the myriad requirements and expectations facing the faculty of a school. In addition, they have learned about the day-to-day responsibilities that demand much of the teacher's time but are not directly related to classroom instruction. Such mundane tasks as counting fees, making copies of classroom assignment, and filling out various reports serve as illustrations.

Today's teacher preparation programs must be structured to meet the needs of tomorrow's educators. They must strive to be practical, experiential, and effective. Also, they must impress upon the future teachers the need for reflective practice, professional development, and lifelong learning. The Professional Development School seeks to move students toward these goals and to produce educators who are equipped for tomorrow's challenges. UTC's PDS program involves all levels of the education hierarchy, from pre-kindergarten through college, which insures that a smoother transition and a more direct connection will be made which should provide a stronger educational system for all affected. The pre-kindergarten experience includes

a three week rotation through the University Children's Center, an accredited pre-school program.

Descriptions of UTC's PDS Schools

Each of UTC's PDS schools operate with notable differences in philosophy and student base. Each school has retained its own program and has adapted to the subsequent PDS organization. Students enrolled in the PK-4, Multidisciplinary (K-4 or 5-8), Middle School, Special Education, and High School certification programs are scheduled to fit within the distinctive programs.

The Professional Development School program correlates very closely with the Hamilton County *Success for all Students* philosophy of hands-on, real-life educational experiences. By being closely involved with various teachers on a day-to-day basis, the UTC students are getting "authentic" experience early in their college career. Not only are the school faculties educating five through eighteen year-olds, but they now feel they have become an integral part of the preparation program of future teachers.

PDS PK-4, K-4, Middle School, Special Education and High School Teaming

The University faculty assigned to the Professional Development Schools collaborate and restructure their 18 credit hours of course work into a series of thematic, interdisciplinary topics appropriate for all PK-4, K-4, 5-8, middle school, special education and secondary preservice teachers. During the planning phase, faculty, referring to their traditional course syllabi, identified topics typically included in their courses and determined areas of duplication, breadth and depth of the content and the approximate amount of time needed for adequate coverage. A schedule was developed which identifies topics, names of instructors and time frames

For example, the topic of assessment is covered in the methods course, the special education course and the reading courses. Through a discussion of the topic, faculty determine subtopics, share presentation ideas, identify resources and complete the daily schedule. The

thematic, interdisciplinary approach facilitates connections and students explore the content and made classroom applications. An immersion experience without changing the existing course structure is accomplished.

Students formerly had difficulty conceptualizing a topical approach in higher education They were unsure how to organize their notebooks, how to label their notes and which courses were being presented. The faculty now facilitate the transition process by eliminating course numbers and titles on daily schedules, and identifying assignments by textbook authors rather than course names and numbers. Students are told which topics to study when preparing for a test, faculty collaborate when grading projects, and when applicable the same grade becomes part of the final grade for two or more courses. Gradually, students are less concerned about course names and use topic names for identification purposes. The courses the students register for are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: PDS Courses listed by Major Certification Areas

PK-4 K-4 Multidisciplinary	Special Education	5-8 Secondary
Prerequisites: EDUC 201	Prerequisites: EDUC 201	Prerequisites: EDUC 201
EDUC 306: Designing Instruction & Evaluation in the Elementary Classroom	EDUC 416: Instructional Procedures for Elementary Exceptional Students	EDUC 433: Designing Instruction & Evaluation in the Secondary Classroom
EDUC 323: Teaching Reading in the Elementary School	EDUC 323: Teaching Reading in the Elementary School	EDUC 321: Teaching Reading in the Secondary School
	EDUC 320: Characteristics of Mild Disabilities	
EDUC 400: Survey of Exceptional Learners	EDUC 400: Survey of Exceptional Learners	EDUC 400: Survey of Exceptional Learners
HECO 345: Management of Early Childhood Environments	EDUC 436: Classroom Management in Special Education	EDUC 418: Middle Grades Organization Curriculum and Instruction
EDUC 499: Professional Development School Field Based Studies	EDUC 499: Professional Development School Field Based Studies	EDUC 499: Professional Development School Field Based Studies

As we began to implement this basic plan, it became obvious how recursive the process would have to be. Numerous revisions were necessary to accommodate time, university faculty and other constraints.

Methodology of the Study

A survey instrument was designed for the University PDS students, UTC PDS faculty, School PDS On-site Coordinators and School Administrators (Gettys, et. al, 1996). The survey instrument utilized a Likert-type scale with terms ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, with the assignment of a rank value of 1 for strongly disagree and a rank value of 5 for strongly agree. There were a total of 30 questions within four areas: (1) Curriculum and Planning for Teaching; (2) Roles; (3) University-PDS Relationships; and (4) Perceptions.

In addition to the Likert-type scaled survey instrument, a second part to the instrument was designed for each of the four groups. This second instrument contained four open-ended questions that dealt with specific questions of how the respondent perceived the PDS experience and provided qualitative data.

The two instruments were designed so that the language within each item pertained to the group being surveyed. The instruments were hand delivered to the PDS on-site coordinators by the researchers during the last week of each semester. There was a week turnaround before the packets were returned to the researchers' offices at UTC.

In establishing validity, a panel of experts reviewed both quantitative and qualitative parts of each of the four instruments. Corrections to the instruments were made as advised by the experts. During the spring of 1999, an additional form was added to include Classroom Teachers in the data pool. Efforts were made to include data from all teachers previously involved with the PDS's.

The surveys have been distributed to the total PDS population. There were five groups reported in the current study: (1) 191 University PDS students; (2) 8 University PDS Professors;

(3) 6 PDS On-site School Coordinators; (4) 47 Classroom Teachers and (5) 4 School Administrators. Descriptive statistics were used to report mean scores to describe each group's perceptions of the 30 items on the instrument. The qualitative data was coded for recurring events and will be summarized later in this paper.

Analysis of Data

Evaluation of the UTC PDS model was begun with the collection of data during the initial year of the PDS, 1995-1996 school year. Evaluation has been continued each semester and this data has been added to the evaluation. The same questionnaire initially designed to evaluate perceptions toward the PDS program is still in use along with the addition of the fifth form for Classroom Teachers which was added in the Spring of 1999. This instrument, initially created to specifically address issues surrounding the development of UTC's Professional Development Schools, has become the source for longitudinal data.

Analysis for differences in perception between and/or among groups was made utilizing all data from the 1995-1996 school year through the 1998-1999 school year. During earlier research analysis (Gettys, et. al, 1997), the only areas that showed any large differences were the areas of University-PDS Relationships and Perceptions. The University PDS faculty perceived a clearer connection between the University and the PDS than the University PDS students.

The study sought to determine how each of the five groups perceived various aspects of the PDS teacher education program as measured by each item on the Evaluation Instrument. A mean score on each item of the Evaluation Instrument was then computed for each group. There were four areas in the instrument (1) Curriculum Planning for Teaching; (2) Role; (3) University-PDS Relationships; and (4) Perceptions.

Curriculum and Planning for Teaching

This area of the questionnaire dealt with items concerned with how the university student applied their professional knowledge base within the professional development school site. The

scores on this portion of the questionnaire ranged from a low of 1for highly unsatisfactory to a high of 5 for strongly agree with the mean scores for each of the five groups recorded on Table 2.

Table 2: Analysis in the Area of Curriculum and Planning for Teaching

	University PDS Students	University PDS Faculty	School PDS On-Site Coordinators	School Administrators	School Classroom Teachers
Recognize an environment that is conducive to learning.	4.7	4.2	4.8	5	4.3
Relate classroom learning and activities to real-life experiences.	4.7	4.5	4.8	5	4
Understand that the school is a vital social institution made up of learners, their families, professionals, and others.	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.2
Plan instructional lessons that take the content, context, and learner into consideration.	4.7	4.5	4.2	4.3	3.7
Plan lessons using a variety of teaching approaches materials.	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.3	3.9
Apply knowledge of developmentally appropriate practices to classroom planning.	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	3.8
Organize instruction to meet the needs of all students.	4.4	3.9	4.2	4.3	3.6
Identify and utilize appropriate classroom management strategies.	4.4	3.7	4.2	4	3.6
Facilitate critical thinking and problem solving within the lessons planned.	4.4	3.8	4.2	4.3	3.6
Utilize appropriate teaching strategies.	4.7	4.2	4.2	4.3	4
Promote and respect equality and diversity.	4.8	4.2	5	4.5	4.1
Communicate effectively with all students.	4.6	3.7	5	4.8	4
Promote students' self-esteem.	4.8	4.5	5	4.8	4.2
Are reflective practitioners.	4.7	3.9	4.8	4.3	3.9

The largest discrepancy occurred in the area of agreement on whether or not university PDS students have become reflective practitioners. University faculty and Classroom Teachers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

rated students growth in this area the lowest. Overall, the Classroom Teachers consistently rated all areas lower than the other four groups.

Roles

The second section of the questionnaire dealt with the roles of the PDS participants and how each group perceived themselves and their relationship within the professional development school site. The scores on this portion of the questionnaire ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 5 with the mean scores for each of the five groups recorded on Table 3.

Table 3: Understanding Various Roles of PDS Participants

	University PDS Students	University PDS Faculty	School PDS On-Site Coordinators	School Administrators	School Classroom Teachers
PDS On-site Coordinator and school administrator as it relates to the PDS program.	4.7	4.2	5	5	4.2
Adapt to the classroom procedures of the classroom assigned to work in.	4.6	4.2	4.5	5	4.2
Classroom teacher expects students to provide active learning experiences in the classroom.	4.2	4.1	4.5	5	4.2
Classroom teacher models effective classroom practices at the PDS site.	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.5	4.3
PDS On-site Coordinator implements the policies and procedures of the University and the PDS site agreement.	4.6	4.4	5	5	4.4
PDS On-site Coordinator endorses the "Teachers as Reflective Practitioners" model.	4.5	4.5	5	5	4.4

School administrators ranked classroom teachers the highest in providing active learning experiences for PDS students in their classrooms while the PDS students, University faculty, and on-site Coordinators gave this a lower score.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University -PDS Relationships

The third area of the questionnaire, University-PDS Relationships, explored the perceptions of the relationships between the Teacher Preparation Academy and the Professional Development School Sites. The scores of the questionnaire ranged from a low of 1 for strongly disagree to a high of 5 for strongly agree with the mean scores for each of the five groups recorded on Table 4.

Table 4: Perceptions of University-PDS Relationships

	University PDS Students	University PDS Faculty	School PDS On-Site Coordinators	School Administrators	School Classroom Teachers
TPA personnel clearly define the objectives of the partnership between the university and the PDS sites.	3.1	4.1	5	4.3	4
TPA professors prepared me for my role in the PDS field experience.	3.0	4.4	4.5	4.3	4
TPA professors communicate regularly with the PDS site personnel.	3.3	4.1	5	4.8	3.8
TPA professors interact with the PDS personnel in a collegial manner.	3.5	4.2	5	4.5	4
TPA professors clearly communicate the goals and objectives of the PDS program and its relationship to the TED.	3.2	4.2	5	4.3	3.9

The University PDS students ranked all areas of this section of the study much lower than the other four groups. This clearly points to areas that need further investigation in terms of refining communication between the Teacher Preparation Academy (TPA) PDS professors with the students regarding the expectations of the program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Perceptions

In the area of Perceptions, all five questions were asked about the attitude of the respondent toward the overall perception of the PDS Program as it effected the Teacher Education Program at UTC. The scores on this portion of the questionnaire ranged from a low of 1 for strongly disagree to a high of 5 for highly agree with the mean scores for each of the five groups recorded on Table 5.

Table 5: Perceptions of the PDS Program

	University PDS Students	University PDS Faculty	School PDS On-Site Coordinators	School Administrators	School Classroom Teachers
Feel good about my role in the PDS program	4.4	4.5	5	5	4.5
Satisfied with the UTC PDS program.	3.4	4.2	5	5	4.2
The graduates of the Teacher Education Program at UTC that have been involved in the PDS Program will be prepared to assume a full-time teaching position.	4.7	4.7	4.8	5	4.4
The PDS experience has better prepared me (the students) for students teaching.	4.8	4.8	5	5	4.7
The PDS experience will increase opportunities for employment.	4.7	4.4	5	5	4.6

In general, overall perceptions of the PDS program are positive for all five groups. The group with the lowest score for satisfaction with the UTC PDS program was the University PDS students. While a number of factors may contribute to this lowered score, the researchers feel

that it is most likely related to students' perceptions of the amount of work, the weekly time commitment, and the intensity of this school based program.

Qualitative Data Summary

Four open-ended questions were asked of each of the five groups participating in the PDS experience. Questions were contained on one page, with two questions on the front and two on the back of the paper. Two of the four questions were worded slightly differently to reflect the different groups completing this part of the survey. The questions asked were the following:

1. In your opinion what are the most valuable outcomes of the PDS experience for preservice university students?
2. In your position, what were the most frustrating parts of the PDS experience?
3. Would you recommend the PDS experience to other students? If so, why? If not, why not?
4. What would you change about the PDS experience?

Results were then subject to independent review, and reviewers examined the responses to identify patterns of responses. The most common categories of response to each of the four questions are found in Tables 6 through 12.

Table 6: Most Frequently Identified Valuable Outcomes of the PDS Experience for University Students (expressed in percentages of each group selecting an outcome)

	University PDS Students N=181	University PDS Faculty N=6	On-Site Coordinators N=3	School Administrators N=3	Classroom Teachers N=35
real world classroom experience	49%	67%	67%		60%
better understanding of demands and responsibilities of teaching	27%	17%	67%	33%	43%
exposure to a variety of teaching/management strategies/styles	36%	17%			20%
better prepared for student teaching/ beginning teaching	20%			33%	20%
friendships/relationships developed on site	62%				
benefit to the children of more adult attention	26%				17%
tie of theory to practice, college instruction to K-12 classroom experience	2%	33%	33%	33%	6%
verification of career choice	27%	17%	67%	100%	43%
exposure to different grade levels/placements	6%	33%	33%	33%	9%

Question 1: Valuable outcomes

There was considerable overlap but also some distinct differences among groups in what were considered the most valuable outcomes for UTC students of the PDS experience.

Participants clearly valued the on-the-job experience of the PDS. All groups expressed the value for students of exposure to the realities of life in the classroom, and the benefits of observing and learning about teaching and management from a variety of teachers. The experience allowed students to verify whether or not they wanted to stick with their decision to be a teacher, and often provided verification of their choice of age or grade for future teaching.

Students gave great emphasis to the valuable relationships that developed at the PDS, whether with students, peers, teachers, or university faculty. The students strongly valued the friendships that developed among the cohort placed at each school. No other group acknowledged this factor, though it was the most often cited by students. Faculty, on-site coordinators, and administrators gave more attention to the opportunity to relate theory and practice than did students or their cooperating teachers.

Though the question asked for benefit to the university student, both these students and their cooperating teachers were unable to ignore the benefit to the K-12 students as well. The extra attention and sets of hands in the classroom was viewed by both groups as a major benefit of the program.

Question 2: Frustrating parts of the experience

Responses to the second question of the survey asked for frustrations specific to each individual group. Most frequent responses are summarized in Tables 7-9.

The clear leader in causing frustration for students was the work load. Students were in classes all day, and then had reading to do and assignments to complete in the evenings. Many had moments when they doubted they could complete the semester successfully. Related frustrations arose from the numerous new tasks of these novice teachers, including lesson planning and unit development. Many students expressed concern that they were often unsure if they were completing tasks correctly, and

expressed a desire for more immediate feedback and clear grading criteria. Several students were dissatisfied with the requirement that they spend time at the UTC Children's Center (a preschool environment serving ages 2-6) during the PDS semester.

Table 7: Most Frequently Identified Frustrating Parts of the PDS Experience for University Students (expressed in percentages selecting an outcome)

Too much work; overwhelmed	62%
Difficulty with lesson plans, unit	24%
insecurity about assignments, knowing what is expected of them	11%
grading issues: subjective or slow, differences among faculty	9%
requirement of preschool rotation	9%

Table 8: Most Frequently Identified Frustrating Parts of the PDS Experience for 3 groups(expressed in percentages selecting an outcome)

University Professors	On-site coordinators (3)	School administrators (3)
not enough time to do all that is needed to be done—100%	helping students with lesson plans, units, and other new skills—67%	teaching lesson plan and unit development—33%
feeling limited control over PDS decisions—17%	helping students keep up with professors' expectations—33%	poor written and oral English of some PDS students-- 33%
concern with stressfulness of experience for students—17%	no frustrations—33%	none—33%

Sample sizes for university professor, on-site coordinators, and school administrators were small, thus few patterns were apparent regarding their frustrations. The distinct exception was the clear message from university faculty that there was not enough time to do all they felt needed to be done at the PDS. On-site coordinators and one administrator expressed their difficulty with supporting students in the difficult tasks of planing lessons and units.

Table 9: Most Frequently Identified Frustrating Parts of the PDS Experience for Classroom Teachers (expressed in percentages selecting an outcome) (N=35)

inappropriate or immature behavior of students	26%
the additional responsibility of training a beginner	20%
not enough time with a student, or not getting a student during a rotation	20%
the time demands of training when a teacher is already busy	17%
problems with communication among all parties	17%

Major frustrations for teachers were being assigned a student who made significant mistakes or behaved immaturely or irresponsibly in the classroom. Regular attendance and promptness were part of their concern. The challenges of having a beginner who needed attention competing with other demands on a teacher's time was another source of frustration.

A more pleasing (to faculty) frustration came when teachers complained that they weren't assigned a PDS student during a rotation, or when they wished a student could have stayed longer in their classroom.

Table 10: Would You Recommend the PDS Experience to Other Students?

	University PDS Students N=181	University PDS Faculty N=6	On-Site Coordinators N=3	School Administrators N=3	Classroom Teachers N=35
yes	77%	100%	100%	100%	57%
no	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
yes with reservations	11%				
no response	11%	0%	0%	0%	43%

Question 3: PDS recommendation to future students

The vast majority of PDS participants would strongly recommend the experience to other students. Reasons cited for theses recommendations were similar to those expressed in response to the "valuable outcomes" question.

Of note is the large number of non-respondents. This question was at the top of the back side of the questionnaire; the majority of survey participants who did not respond to this question also neglected to respond to the other question of the back of the questionnaire. It may be they were unaware that these questions were there.

Students were unique in recommending the PDS experience with qualifications. Several suggested that persons who had families or who had to work to support themselves may want to carefully consider whether the sacrifice of their time and energy was worth it.

Question 4: Recommendations for changes to the PDS experience

The fourth and final question on the open-ended survey asked for recommendations for modification of the PDS I experience. There were a wide variety of responses from participants, with few patterns emerging. The most common responses are covered in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11: What would you change about the PDS?
(UTC students and classroom teachers)

University students	Classroom teachers
Reduce amount of work, set more realistic expectations—13%	No response--57%
Have smaller steps, start earlier, have clearer rubric for unit—9%	Stress and have consequences for absences/tardies-- 9%
Teach more on methods, classroom management— 7%	Explain professional responsibilities to students more clearly—9%

Table 12: What would you change about the PDS?
(UTC faculty, on-site coordinators and school administrators)

University professor	On-site coordinators	School administrators
Assign to PDS fulltime, every other semester-- 33%	Increased time in the classroom for university students—67%	provide similar opportunity to secondary students
Revise schedule-- 33%	keep working on theory/ application relationship-- 33%	keep working on theory/ application relationship-- 33%
Allowance/more time for site-based decision making-- 33%		nothing-- 33%

Summary

A key factor to the success of the UTC PDS program has been the relationship that has been established between the university and the local school system by the on-site coordinators. Initially these on-site coordinators were employees of the public school system who also maintained adjunct faculty status at the University of Tennessee. They served as consultants on the planning team during the initial planning stage and again as participants as the program is actually carried out. They are at the site daily to meet the immediate needs of the university students. A cut in funding has recently required university faculty to assume this responsibility at two PDS sites. A funding source has once again been identified to return the position of on-site coordinators to the site-based management teams of the school system (Bibler personal conversation with researchers, November, 1999).

A second key factor to the success of the PDS experience is the licensure given the university faculty to make changes within the program from semester to semester. This factor allows University faculty to model the collaboration between teachers that is essential to public schools today.

Another factor which is key to the success of the PDS experience is the enthusiasm of the university faculty involved in the program at each of the PDS sites. This type of collaborative

teaching requires more classroom contact and presentation hours than the typical on-campus course. True appreciation for other professors' expertise has developed through this collaborative approach.

A final factor contributing to a successful PDS is the selection of sites whose philosophy and faculty support the PDS concept. Schools change when they become professional development schools, with accompanying changes in teacher roles. Teachers must be willing and even enthusiastic in welcoming additional adults into their classrooms. Administrators must be supportive of a busy community of learners exploring new roles.

Recommendations for Future Research

UTC agrees with the findings of Stallings and Kowalski (1990) on Professional Development Schools, which emphasize the critical need for longitudinal evaluations and experiments that explore the effectiveness of the PDS models in undergraduate/graduate teacher preparation leading to licensure. We recommend that a thorough on-going evaluation be continued at UTC so that the effectiveness of the PDS model will be validated over time. Specifically, as an effort to answer the research question, "Does the PDS experience develop a better beginning teacher?" a longitudinal evaluation should be conducted by an outside group to compare PDS and non-PDS students' university classwork grades, evaluation of teaching behaviors of PDS and non-PDS students should be made during the student teaching semester and, ideally, data should also be gathered during their first few years of teaching.

References

Berg, M., & Murphy, D. (1993). Through the looking glass: Linking theory and practice in teacher preparation. *Contemporary Education*, 64 (4), 252-254.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986) *A nation prepared: Teachers for the twenty-first century.* New York.

Colblurn, Alan. (1993). *Creating professional development schools.* Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation Fastback, #352, Bloomington, Indiana.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. (1996). What Matters Most. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (2). 193-200.

Dixon, P. & Ishler, R. (1992). Professional development schools. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43 (1), 28-34.

Fullan, M.G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gettys, C.M., Ray, B.M., et. al (1996). *An Analysis of Initial Perception of the Professional Development School Experience*. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Association, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, November 8, 1996. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) System. ED405299. SP037176.

Gettys, C.M. & Puckett, K.S., et. al (1997). *The Professional Development School (PDS) Experience: The Beginning of a Longitudinal Study*. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Association, Memphis, Tennessee, November 13, 1997.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Nowacek, E.J. & Blanton, L.P. (1996). A Pilot Project Investigating the Influence of a Collaborative Methods Course on Preservice Elementary Education Teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 19 (4), 298-312.

Irvin, G. (1990). Collaborative teacher education. *Phi Delta Kappan* 71 (7) 622-24.

Million, S. K. & Vare, J. W. (1996). The Collaborative School: A Proposal for Authentic Partnership In a Professional Development School. *Phi Delta Kappan* 78 (9) 710-713.

Sid W. Richardson Foundation. (1993). *The professional development school: A commonsense approach to improving education*. Fort Worth, TX: Author.

Sirotnik, K.A., and Goodlad, J.I. (1988). Research on professional development schools. In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by W.R. Houston. New York: Macmillan.

Teitel, L. (1994). Can school-university partnerships lead to the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education? *Journal of Teacher Education*. 45 (4). 245-252.

Teitel, L. (1999). *Research on Professional Development Schools*, Teacher Education Yearbook VII Summary. ATE Newsletter. September, October.

Wise, Arthur E. (1996). Building a System of Quality Assurance for the Teaching Profession. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (3). 191-192.